son objected to his social prominence. He said of him: "Why, sir, he is not a personage, he is a person." Mr. Johnson held that only great personages should be at the head of great establishments. Mr. Dana would satisfy Mr. Johnson's definition of a great personage. His vast acquirements, his enormous intellectual equipment, and, above all, his perfect physical condition, mark him as one of the most notable men of his time. He comes to his daily work at the Sun office because he enjoys it. When he turns from it he leaves it as if there were no such place in the world, and while he is away from it his eager, alert, beautifully disciplined mind is constantly going from one subject of interest to another, gathering constantly new facts, new ideas, new pictures of things.

The outside public, who know him as a critic, think of him as an austere, cold-blooded, uncertain tempered man. The reverse of this is the truth. His temper is kindly; his manners those of a philosophical man of the world, whom nothing ordinary annoys or ruffles. His ferocity is purely literary. He has a keen hatred of shams and of humbug. He has seen too much, traveled too much and lived too much to concern himself greatly about trifles.

I called upon him several times during the week. Sometimes when he answered my persistent questions he would leave his proofs or papers and walk up and down the floor. In nothing did he show the slightest hesitation. This conversation, which I give in the form of a verbatim report, will be found interesting to every one who is interested in wholesome views; in experience based upon correct knowledge, and to those who wish to find the point and pith of Mr. Dana's fifty years of work in the field of journalism, literature, science and statesmanship I know of nothing which should more interest a writer than Mr. Dana's views concerning the requirements for a writer. Probably there is no experience in Mr. Dana's life which had a greater influence upon him than his three or four years at Brook Farm, where he was nursery gardener, head-waiter and teacher of languages in a community of highly intelligent and refined gentlemen and ladies, who were brought together with the high purpose of seeking to improve the world by inventing simpler and less complex ways of living.

Mr. Dana has been often asked to write the history of his experiences at Brook Farm, but he has always been too busy. What he said in this interview is his first public utterance upon the subject, and will be found full of interest. His experience as a correspondent in Europe during the revolution of 1848 broadened out his mind to a world's view of things when he was still a young man. Now he keeps in constant touch with the old world by constantly returning to renew his connections and experiences with the life wholly apart from the one which occupies him eight or nine months of the year. It is in the diversity of occupation and wholesome discipline of varied study, his constant seeking for fresh "fields and pastures new" that Mr. Dana finds his energy, his freshness and his clearness of vision.

But I am sure that the readers of this article will be much more interested in what Mr. Dana has to say for himself than I can say for him, and so I gave way for the more formal question and answer which ran hap-hazard through the course of several visits, and perhaps will give a better idea of Mr. Dana's character than could anything else short of actually seeing and talking with him.

OUTLINES A DAY'S ROUTINE.

"Mr. Dana, will you kindly outline your mental habits and the day's routine?"

"Mental habits? I don't know as I have any. I suppose I must have, for every man has them. I never worked at home either at night or morning; never study at home. It is all done here and in the railroad trains. I get down here, take the year through, about 10 or 11 o'clock. The first thing I do is to read my letters; then read the newspapers; cut out anything I want; then I read the proofs, read them all every day of the entire Sun—not all with attention, but go through them all. I don't bother about work after I get away in the afternoon. I stop usually from 4 to 5:30, and after that I do not bother myself with it, unless they send to me."

"You have done a great deal of outside work. Was that done at your office?"

"Never. I always had a separate office for that. When I was a young fellow I made a very laborious collection of poetry; that I made in my home, and when we made the American Encyclopædia there was a large office for that. That was a large enterprise and a large staff, but the ordinary things we call work and study are done here."

"And then at home?"

"At home? Nothing but get my dinner, amuse myself, go to the theater or to visit friends."

"You have the reputation of being a great collector?"

"That is done around the shops and when traveling."

"You are said to be a great cultivator of roses?"

"No, I am not. I have a small place down on Long island called 'West Island,' and there I cultivate every tree and plant of the temperate zone, and there is a very extensive collection of plants, but all that is attended to on Sundays and afternoons after I get home."

"Then you travel sixty miles every day?"

"Just about."

"Do you consider that a waste of time?"

"Oh, no."

"How can you utilize the time?"

"Thirty miles is about an hour's ride; takes about an hour and three-quarters from the office to the house, and there I see a good many people. In the morning I read the papers, and after that sleep and take a nap. No, time is not wasted when you are not doing anything."

"It was the idea of the Puritans that it was."

"The Puritan's idea was that there should not be any pleasure in the world."

"Don't you think that your habit of letting your work go and devoting yourself to congenial things, as much as anything, has given you your strength and ability to work?"

"It is a vacation—it is a vacation."

"Your work is your vacation?"

"No, the other is a vacation. I bought this country place twenty years ago, and spend a great deal of time there, including all the Sundays, and I think it is so much gain, apart from the pleasure."

"How much of the time do you actually devote to the detail work of the paper?"

"Here, to-day, for instance. I came here at 10:30, rather later than usual, and I shall go away at quarter of 4. That is, about four, five or six hours, but generally, I should say, taking the year through, five or six hours."

"What class of work do you do on the newspaper?"

"Pretty nearly every class. I do not write a great deal, but I always have a stenographer."

"You think that the editor of a great journal should write very much?"

"Just as it happens."

"But there should be no rule?"

"Well, just as it happens."

"Don't you think the editing of a paper more important work than writing?"

"More important to the paper—yes, I do."

"The work of the editor is using his judgment as to what should be printed or not printed?"

"Certainly it is."

"Do you give your attention to other topics than political?"

"Every sort of topic—everything."

"Anything that is of interest to humanity?"

HIS IDEA OF A VACATION.

"Everything. I take an excursion every year of one, two or three months; generally go to Europe. I regard it as very important to get entirely out of the rut; to go where nobody can reach you with any questions, telegrams; avoid the necessity of writing letters of recommendation—anything. That is a pure vacation."

"Letters of recommendation? Is there not a great deal of your time sought by those who come here to get you to grind their private axes?"

"Oh, I don't see them. I don't see anybody I do not know, who does not bring a letter. I cannot. I don't see ladies who come here if I don't know them. They want to get a poem put in, or get anything done; but I let them state the case in writing."

"In other words, your time is so occupied you cannot afford to throw it away?"

"I can't. I have got to get away from here to-day at a quarter of 4. If I did not have that sort of rule I would not get away until a quarter of 6."

"There are people who hold that the editor of a paper should practically hold a town meeting every day, and during one or two hours meet people as does the President, that he may receive suggestions of value."

"I don't think so. The number of people who come to make such suggestions is small. Most people come for some purpose of their own. I see a great many people first and last. A gentleman comes from Peoria, for instance, sends in his name and wants to shake hands. A newspaper man from Boston came, the other day, with his wife, and no matter how busy I am I must see such a man. Those are people you want to see."

"Do you observe any special rules to keep yourself in good physical condition?"

"No, except not to eat too much."

"I never saw anyone of your age, who does so much work, in such fine condition."

"The only rule is, not to eat too much."

"How about sleeping?"

"If you don't sleep you can't work. I sleep at least eight hours."

"Do you use any wines?"

"I drink a little whisky and water. When I was a young fellow I drank wine, but now the doctors say I must let it alone, or I will have the gout."

"Do you smoke?"

"Never. But I am very fond of it. When I was about thirteen I smoked a cigar that was too much for me; I have never smoked since. Yet I am very fond of the odor and flavor."

"Don't you think that much of your fine physical condition comes from your tranquility of mind? You are not easily worried?"

"My nerves are good, and I don't easily get excited. One inherits these things."

"Then you come from a long-lived stock?"

"Yes, from a long-lived stock, and generally a good-natured stock."

"Do you take exercise?"

"I take a great deal of exercise. A man who travels thirty miles a day on the railroad, and by carriage—drives himself—then walks around his place half an hour or so; gets up at 6:30 or 7 o'clock in the morning, takes a great deal of exercise. I don't take any regular exercise."

"Do you follow what is called an American diet? Do you take a heavy breakfast?"

"When I live in France I follow the French system. Here I have to take it as I can get it."

"When you write, do you dictate or write with your own hand?"

"Almost always dictate."

ALWAYS DICTATES.

"Which do you consider the best method of arriving at the best results?"

"Dictation."

"I once heard Mr. Blaine say that he did not think the highest classical work could be arrived at by a writer who dictated."

"I don't believe that. It is a mere question of thought. If you have the thing in your mind you can express it yourself, or dictate it to any one. I don't think it makes much difference. If your articles have the ideas and thoughts, the principal thing, they will produce their own effect. Whether they are signed John Smith or Horace Greeley, what difference does it make, except a man may be attached to Horace Greeley, and think whatever he says is of importance; but generally speaking the effect is in the ideas."

"Except as you stated the other day, the common minds of people are very much influenced by what is said for them, and they might have more confidence in one writer than another?"

"That is so, but, generally speaking, you take a paper—take the Herald, for instance. In the days of Bennett—he was a great genius—it was not necessary any article should be signed. He wrote most of them himself, and the others got his knack. If they had been signed they would not have had any more effect, or any less, as I can see."

"Do you think the tendency to public life is improving or the reverse?"

"In what sense?"

"Morality, good character, honesty."

"I think it is improving. Men are born more honest than they used to be. It is because this infiltration of ideas of moral uprightness, justice and truth is continually working in the minds of men. Besides, men are getting more independent. A rich man is more likely to be honest than a poor man. He is less tempted. There is nothing to be gained, and everything to be lost."

"And about these great aggregations of fortunes?"

"They constitute a promise. They preserve the means of doing great things. You conceive the idea of doing some great thing. You can do it; but if you only had a thousand dollars, you could not do it."

"Do you think the rich men of this country have as yet given evidence to sustain that view?"

"The effort of the rich man is just beginning, and riches is going to be a sort of drug. When I was a child a man who had $10,000 was of more consequence than a man who is now worth ten millions, because of his superiority to the mass of people. Oh, there have been great changes."

BELIEVES IN RELIGION OF HUMANITY.

"Do you think there will be any attempt made to limit these fortunes?"

"Oh, yes; all sorts of foolish attempts are possible."

"Do you agree with the idea advanced by Governor Boutwell that it would be advisable to enact laws forbidding rich men owning a certain amount of property, say a million or above, from making will and enforcing them to leave their property by an equal distribution to their heirs under the law as it now exists when a person dies intestate?"

"I object to anything that limits the freedom of man. It would be just like saying a man should drink only so much water or beer, or so much tea or coffee."

"I was talking with a great London banker the other day. He said that these aggregations of wealth would become, in the next ten or twenty years, something beyond the history of the world, and it was a question with him how we could get on under the shadow of such financial aggregations?"

"Why, even now a man can't lend money at 1 per cent. in London. There are hundreds of millions lying idle in this town because they can't be lent. I have great faith in divine providence and in the normal development of society."

"Do you think that money, being a drug to rich men, will be in the end the means of their being obliged to do good with it?"

"I don't know what doing good is, as a rule, and nobody invests money unless it is for profit. I have no faith in pauperism."

"Are you a religious man?"

"Yes."

"What religion do you believe in?"

"I was brought up a Calvinist, then I became a Unitarian, then a Swedenborgian. Now I don't belong to any church. Many of my best friends are Catholics. I believe in the religion of humanity."

"You believe, of course, in a supreme being?"

"I believe in a divine providence, and a divine destiny for all things."

THE EQUIPMENT FOR A JOURNALIST.

"What do you think are the requirements for a young man who wishes to enter journalism?"

"Good health, good temper, upright principles, the best education he can possibly get, and the most varied knowledge, provided it is accurate. Inaccurate knowledge is a nuisance."

"I think you said in a former talk that he should know the Bible and Shakspeare?"

"That is a special thing, and the best outfit for a journalist is to know the Bible, to know Shakspeare and the Constitution of the United States. His knowledge of the Bible should be sufficient to enable him to know where any passage comes from—whether from Samuel, the Psalms or the Revelations. He should also have convictions, especially political convictions. If he belongs to some one of the great parties that is better, because those are the great agencies of political and social life. The little parties are always skirmishing on a side of the field."

"What is your opinion as to the value of a college education in journalism; that is, as between the college graduate and one who is not a college graduate?"

"The college graduate is better qualified to win the race. A college education which has been acquired with zeal and accuracy places a man in the same position as a horse brought forward to run, well fed and well trained. He can usually beat one not well fed or well fitted."

"Will you kindly give me your idea on the subject of a school of journalism to train young men in the first step?"

"I don't believe in that, because the education the journalist wants is general education—the more general the better. He should have every knowledge and every experience. For instance, it is of great importance to have experienced religion, if a man wants to be a journalist—I mean religion in the old orthodox sense. He should have been through the intellectual stage which belongs to the conviction that he is lost, and can only be saved by Jesus Christ; because that is a human experience of great importance. It makes an immense contribution to his intellectual resources. A school for journalism may be very useful, but I think that the boy who comes in here to my room thirty or forty times a day to execute the orders he receives will have more professional knowledge after a while than anyone could get in a school of journalism."

THINGS THAT HELP.

"You think a man should be serious-minded to succeed?"

"Yes, that is true; a man must have a sense of honor, and make up his mind to get what he is after, and go for it with energy. A man may be frivolous all the same, on the outside."

"You believe that the study of languages is important?"

"It is an advantage. The knowledge of languages is a great convenience, especially in traveling abroad, and the knowledge of languages involves a knowledge of literature; gives a larger range of information."

"Have you studied modern languages?"

"Yes; always for some particular reason, not for the sake of learning the languages. One wants to know French in traveling. I learned Italian because I wanted to read Dante. I have meant not to read any great thing except in the original—except the Bible and the 'Arabian Nights.' The other literatures I have gone for in the original."

"How many years have you been in journalism?"

"Since, I should say, about 1842 or 1844—fifty years or so."

"During that period what do you consider the greatest development and changes?"

"The changes have been continual. The war was very important, but the interest of the war depended more on institutions—the newspapers were rather a secondary thing. It had its effect on the newspapers, but I should not think that was the most important power that acted on the newspapers. The telegraph was a great thing in the development of newspapers; so was the invention of fast presses, and now we are on the eve of the adoption of composing machines. There are already several of them competing for preference."

"Do you think the newspapers can ever be published at a cheaper price with these mechanical improvements?"

"I don't see how they can."

"What is the prime object, from your stand-point, in the publication of a newspaper?"

"That is a complicated question. The great object, of course, is business. A newspaper is published for the sake of profit, like any other business; then after that comes the intellectual motive, the success of a cause, the supremacy of one party over another, all those things which intellectual men contend about, but no newspaper could be published unless it paid, and when you take a modern newspaper, with the capital that is required to carry it on, where, for instance, it has to have a half dozen presses that cost $150,000 each, it is plain there must be a considerable profit or the enterprise would not live."

"What is the great expense for producing the Sun for a day?"

"I never calculated. I should say, take the whole thing, all around, month by month, about $4,000 a day. On careful scrutiny it may be more or less, but it would not vary much, I think."

"Then you don't think the question of morality, or improving the public, enters any more into the conduct of a newspaper than any other business?"

"Yes, a little more, because the intellectual character of a newspaper requires it to discuss political moral questions, and this fact makes it a matter of more consequence—makes morality and public wellbeing of more consequence to it than to any other business. Moreover, there is a certain responsibility enforced upon a newspaper. If it shocks the moral sentiment of the community it is punished for it, by losing business."

THE ISSUES OF THE CAMPAIGN.

"What do you think is going to be the issue between the parties in the coming campaign?"

"The first issue between the parties is success. The platforms cut a great figure, of course, but if you will notice, they are generally so formed on both sides as to avoid, as far as possible, the dangerous points. For instance, the money part of the Republicans platform is as near a gold basis as possible, and yet they have disguised it, so that the free-silver Republicans may be satisfied and stick to the ticket; and the platform at Chicago has been constructed very much on the same idea. Yet there are certain vital principles at issue between the parties, as everybody understands, that make it a matter of conscience on one side or the other. For instance, Republican success means a force bill, and Democratic success means no force bill. But the business of making a platform is to get all the votes you can, and while you are expressing the distinctive ideas of your party to lose just as few votes as possible."

"On the whole, you feel that this country is in a very prosperous condition, and there are no dangers ahead?"

"There are dangers ahead always. Every man is liable to catch the typhoid fever; but, on the whole, the situation is good and the prospect encouraging—much better than when I was a child, fifty years ago."

"I would like your idea concerning the practicability of illustrating daily newspapers, in the sense of the pictorial art of the better class of weekly publications."

"In the sense of presenting pictures of possible events; is that what you mean? I don't see any reason why they should not be illustrated, if you can only invent some process of sufficient rapidity to make it practicable. Now, we cannot illustrate current events to any extent to make it worth our while, because there is no process rapid enough to produce any adequate reproduction of any interesting event. As it stands now, the business of daily newspaper illustration is chiefly valuable for portraits. What you want in a picture is information, and if you get only information into a picture of events that would be a great gain."

"Upon what lines are the improvements of the newspapers of the future to move?"

"They move in every line where improvements can be found."

"Is there anything in particular that occurs to you?"

"No; you can't tell what is going to happen."

"What was it that first directed your attention to journalism?"

"A natural disposition to write. I don't know of anything else. When I was a boy of fourteen I used to write letters to the papers, put them in the box, and wait to see if they would be published. Then when I got to a place where I could write with some effect it was natural I should do it, and I did it."

EARLY JOURNALISTIC EXPERIENCE.

"What first directs a man into a profession is always interesting."

"We had at Brook Farm a weekly paper called the Harbinger, very handsomely printed, and certain things had to be written for it. As it was convenient for me to write I wrote, and naturally became a regular writer; then, afterward, all the people who read those papers knew me. I first went into the Chronotype, in Boston, established by Elizur Wright, and I became Wright's principal assistant. He had no money, but he was witty and capable. I got $5 a week. Then I came to the Tribune, as city editor, in 1847."

"How old were you then?"

"Twenty-eight! I began as city editor at $14 a week, and I had $14 a week until I went to Europe to report the revolution in 1848 for the Tribune and other papers. I wrote five long letters every week in Paris, Berlin and Vienna. Then there was no telegraph; the mail was the only thing."

"What do you consider the greatest piece of work you did at that time?"

"Oh, I don't know. James Russell Lowell always complimented me on a letter regarding the general effect of a possible march of the French troops into Italy. It was simply a statement of facts which happened in 1848, but still it was not very valuable. It was clear, that was all."

"Don't you think it had an important effect upon you—this experience?"

"Certainly, it was of great value. I was in Paris during the bloody days of June, 1848. In Berlin I saw the assembly of delegates from all Germany. I stayed there once two months reporting it, then I went to Vienna. A revolution had occurred there, and the Austrian government was driven out."

"You saw all the great characters then?"

"Well, I saw Louis Napoleon, Thiers, Montalembert and many of the great men of the day."

"Bismarck had not been heard of then, had he?"

"He must have been an important man then, but he did not appear; he was not one of the conspicuous figures at all."

"You saw the French empire start?"

"It started after I got home. I saw Louis Napoleon elected President. I had no impression that it would last as a republic, but I hoped so."

"What was the Brook Farm experiment?"

THE BROOK FARM EXPERIMENT.

"The Brook Farm experiment was that of a general manifestation that took place all over this country along about 1840. Every intellectual man in the United States, by some spontaneous operation, seemed to have a general tendency to the study of co-operative social organization, and it was everywhere. In Massachusetts George Ripley, who was a superior Unitarian clergyman and a remarkable scholar, and his wife took the lead. They had held meetings of their friends for a long time, and concluded that they would try the experiment of democracy in society life, so they went out and established the community at Brook Farm. The business was to be agriculture and education. They were all learned people and familiar with the cause of education, and thought they could create a school there and carry on the farm. They bought a farm of two hundred acres of land eight miles from Boston. The enterprise lasted from 1841 until about March, 1846."

"Were you there all through?"

"Not through the whole of it. I was there until its failure was substantially brought about by the burning of a large building in which they had invested all their money. Then I left and went to the Chronotype in Boston."

"Do you think the idea was good?"

"It was a benevolent association. The idea was most poetical and attractive. Co-operation on a religious basis has long been successful in this country. The Shakers were rich; the German communities at Zoar and Economy were rich. These philosophers and poets wanted to have a different style of living and working. They were profoundly democratic. They objected to the existing methods of domestic service especially. Everything should be on the basis of humanity, economy and equality. This sort of social reform started up all over the country. There was one community established at Sodus bay, on Lake Ontario, one near Canandaigua, and one lasted a long while at Redbank, in New Jersey. There were two or three others in Massachusetts, some on one plan, some on another. Some were quite religious. That at Brook Farm was purely democratic. All were equal. Each man was paid at the same rate for his work. The shoemaker was paid as much as the president of the establishment."

"How do you think that would do applied to real life?"

NOT PRACTICAL.

"I don't think it would wash at all. It takes away the premium on superior intelligence. During the time I was there there were some students in the Newton Theological Seminary and some young ladies in a school near by. The young men at Newton wanted a teacher of German, and the young ladies wanted a teacher of Spanish. I went over and taught the men German and the ladies Spanish, and received the same rates they would have paid any other teacher, and that was turned into the treasury. It was more than my allowance as a member of the society. That was the system."

"There were some remarkable people there, I suppose?"

"The people were most of them delightful people and of great cultivation."

"Who were they?"

"George Ripley and his wife, John S. Dwight, who now lives in Boston."

"And Margaret Fuller?"

"Margaret Fuller never lived there, but used to visit there. Hawthorne came once and stayed a month."

"On a vacation?"

"No, because he wanted to. I don't think he had any regular vacation, and he had no regular occupation then. Then there was Orestes A. Brownson; Theodore Parker lived within a mile and a half, and Francis George Shaw came often. Altogether, it was one of the most intelligent and poetical societies that anybody could be in, and all on this democratic basis."

"How did you pass your time—waiting on each other?"

"I had a good deal of teaching. Mrs. Ripley, Dwight and I were the principal teachers, and there were all sorts of things to be taught—Latin, Greek, German, Spanish, mathematics, and everything. Then I had charge of the fruit department, the nursery of fruit trees. I planted the nursery and started on with that. I didn't know anything about the business at the beginning."

"You were then about twenty-one?"

"About twenty-two."

"And that was your first business experience?"

"No, I had been brought up in business in a dry goods store in Buffalo, so that I knew about the business."

"Somebody once told me that you took up a new science every year?"

"If there's anything I want, I go for it. The last few years I have been studying Ibsen."

"What do you think of Ibsen?"

"Ibsen is a man of great genius, but he is an irregular man, and his sincerity he leaves you to doubt about. He is a man of great conceit, interesting but unsatisfactory, almost always."

"What do you think was the effect of that Brook Farm life on your future career?"

A USEFUL EXPERIMENT.

"Well, it was a good wholesome life, a life out of doors, and left the man free; after he got through with it he could turn to anything, study law, become a teacher, a laborer on a railroad or anything. A man came out of it pretty free."

"Was it something on the idea of a Chautauqua?"

"No: it was more a sort of a social picnic. The Chautauqua is a regular organization, a regular machine. Here there was almost no machinery. Each one did what he wanted to do. For instance, I was a head waiter, chief of a regular corps of waiters, fine young fellows, who waited on the tables every day at dinner."

"And you enjoyed it?"

"Very much! very much! Immensely!"

"And you had fun poked at you by the newspapers?"

"They didn't understand it. But there was very little of this fun that we cared for. We were reformers and were going to revolutionize the world. We cared nothing for fun made of us."

"Was everything in harmony? Was there a good deal of quarreling about the way the world should be steered?"

"There was always more or less friction, as, of course, there would be in such a concern, where some worked harder than others. Some thought their judgment was not sufficiently regarded in the management of the business. There were natural differences, such as would arise in any place. It was a partnership, but nobody had a cent to pay; there were no assessments."

"And no contributions?"

"No, none, except as outside friends who were interested in the scheme lent money to the enterprise. In the final settlement some of this was lost, of course, but it was very little, considering the extent and duration of the concern. It proved one thing—that people can live together in comfort at a very cheap rate."

[*Copyright, 1892, by Bacheller & Johnson.*]

Changes in Pronunciation.

Brander Matthews, in Harper.

Pronunciation is slowly but steadily changing. Sometimes it is going further and further away from the orthography; for example, either and neither are getting more and more to have in their first syllable the long i sound instead of the long e sound which they had once. Sometimes it is being modified to agree with the orthography; for example, the older pronunciations of again to rhyme with men, and of been to rhyme with pin, in which I was carefully trained as a boy, seem to me to be giving way before a pronunciation in exact accord with the spelling, again to rhyme with pain, and been to rhyme with seen. These two illustrations are from the necessarily circumscribed experience of a single observer, and the observation of others may not bear me out in my opinion; but though the illustrations fall to the ground, the main assertion, that pronunciation is changing, is indisputable.

A More Harmless Outlet.

Philadelphia Inquirer.

In extraordinary spectacles the British elections are outdoing anything that we have known in this country for many a year. The brutal instincts which led to the stoning of Mr. Gladstone and the insulting of Mr. Stanley find a safe outlet in this country through the columns of the New York free-trade press.

Sunday Journal, by mail, $2 a Year